

REMARKS

Within the Office Action dated October 03, 2007, the Examiner objected to claims 1, 9 and 17 for an informality. Claims 1-2, 9-10 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C section 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent 7,089,321 B2 to Hayashi (Hayashi). Claims 3 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi, in view of United States Patent Application 2007/0,199,030 to Ellis et al. (Ellis). Claims 4 and 12 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of United States Patent 2004/0,221,302 to Ansari (Ansari). Claims 5-7 and 13-15 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of United States Patent Application 2006/0,179,462 to Willame (Willame). Claims 8 and 16 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Willame, and in view of United States Patent Application 2004/0,268,407 to Sparrell (Sparrell).

By this amendment Applicants amend claims 1, 3, 8-9 and 16-17, add new claims 18-21, and do not cancel any claims. Accordingly, claims 1-21 will be pending in the application upon entry of this amendment.

I. Objection to Claims 1, 9 and 17

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 9 and 17 for an informality. More specifically, the claims should recite “to deliver said service to said clients.” Applicants amend the claims in view of the objection, and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 1, 9 and 17.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-8

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2 under section 102(b) as being unpatentable over Hayashi. Claim 3 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi, in view

of Ellis. Claim 4 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi, in view of Ansari. Claims 5-7 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Willame. Claim 8 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi, in view of Willame and further in view of Sparrell. Claims 2-8 are dependent on claim 1.

Claim 1 recites a method for networking several clients in a personal video recording (“PVR”) system. The method receives several television signals and tunes each of the television signals in one of several tuners. The method buffers the television signals on a storage medium in at least one PVR media server. The method couples several clients, over a network, to the PVR media server. The method receives at least one request from each of at least two clients for at least one service in the PVR system, and allocates resources of the PVR system to the clients, as appropriate, to deliver the service to the clients. The method designates one of at least three states to a first tuner. The at least three states comprise at least: a busy state, a maybe free state, and a totally free state. The states are used to allocate tuners to the requesting clients. The resources of the PVR system include the tuners. The first tuner comprises a first designated state.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hayashi does not disclose, teach, or even suggest such a method. For instance, Hayashi does not disclose, teach, or even suggest designating one of at least three states comprising at least: a busy state, a maybe free state, and a totally free state, to a tuner. As recited by claim 1, the states are used to allocate tuners to the requesting clients. The resources of the PVR system include the tuners, and the first tuner comprises a first designated state. Some of the cited references discuss various means of determining whether a

device is receiving current or power, but none of the cited references disclose, teach, or even suggest all of the elements of claim 1.

Accordingly, the cited references do not render unpatentable claim 1. Since claims 2-8 are dependent on claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render unpatentable claims 2-8 for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8.

III. Rejection of Claims 9-16

Claims 9-10 were rejected under section 102(b) as being anticipated by Hayashi. Claim 11 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi, in view of Ellis. Claim 12 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Ansari. Claims 13-15 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Willame. Claim 16 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Willame, and in view of Sparrell. Claims 10-16 are dependent on claim 9.

Claim 9 recites a personal video recording (“PVR”) media server comprising an input for receiving several television signals, several tuners, a storage medium, and a network interface. The tuners are for tuning each of the television signals, and the storage medium is for buffering the television signals. The network interface is for coupling several clients, over a network, to the PVR media server. The PVR media server is for receiving at least one request from each of at least two clients for at least one service of a PVR system, and for allocating resources of the PVR system to the clients, as appropriate, to deliver the service to the clients. The server designates one of at least three states to a first tuner. The at least three states comprise at least: a busy state, a maybe free state, and a totally free state. The states are used to allocate tuners to

the requesting clients. The resources of the PVR system include the tuners. The first tuner comprises a first designated state.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hayashi does not disclose, teach, or even suggest such a server. For instance, the cited portions of Hayashi do not disclose, teach, or even suggest designating one of at least three states comprising at least: a busy state, a maybe free state, and a totally free state, to a tuner. As recited by claim 9, the states are used to allocate tuners to the requesting clients. The resources of the PVR system include the tuners, and the first tuner comprises a first designated state. Some of the cited references discuss various means of determining whether a device is receiving current or power, but none of the cited references disclose, teach, or even suggest all of the elements recited by claim 9.

Accordingly, the cited references do not render unpatentable claim 9. Since claims 10-16 are dependent on claim 9, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render unpatentable claims 10-16 for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 9. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-16.

III. Rejection of Claim 17

Claim 17 was rejected under section 102(b) as being anticipated by Hayashi. Claim 17 recites a personal video recording (“PVR”) system comprising at least one PVR media server, a network, and several clients. The PVR media server has an input for receiving several television signals, several tuners for tuning each of the television signals, and a storage medium for buffering the television signals. The clients are coupled over the network to the PVR media server. The PVR media server is configured for receiving at least one request from each of at least two clients for at least one service in the PVR system, and for allocating resources of the

